IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	10/729,258	Confirmation No.	1160
Applicant	:	Dan Bradley O'Bryan		
Filed	:	12/05/2003		
Group Art Unit	:	2192		
Examiner	:	Andrew Y. Chou		
Title	:	System and Method for Building an Application on a Computing Device		
	:	which Includes an Environment-Controlling Process		
Atty. Docket No.	:	2675/SPRI.111309		
Customer No.	:	32423		

Submitted VIA EFS WEB — March 21, 2008

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

This is an Amended Appeal Brief submitted in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed March 13, 2008 Applicant hereby submits this Amended Brief within the one-month deadline of April 13, 2008. It is believed that no payment is due with this submission.

Contents follow.

Contents

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P., a limited

partnership duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States of

America. The mailing address for purposes of this Appeal is 6391 Sprint Parkway, Overland

Park, Kansas 66251-2100, "attention Melissa Jobe or Sally Werts."

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

None.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-26 are pending and are the subject of this appeal.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No after-final amendments were submitted, but remarks submitted Aug. 30, 2007, were

entered on January 8, 2008.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Of claims 1-26, claims 1, 15, and 21 are independent. The present invention is defined

by the claims but, summarily, embodiments of the invention are directed to methods, systems,

and computer-readable media for building an application on two computing devices. *See*

Specification, pg. 4, ll. 2-17. The first computer checks out files from a version-controlling

software repository and the second computer is used to build the software application. *Id.* Two

files are used to aid in the software-building process. *Id.*, pg. 13, ll. 7-14. A first file is provided

that substantially includes only parameters that do not depend on a specific environment. *Id.* A

second file is provided that substantially includes only parameters that are environment-specific.

Id. The two files are accessed by the first computing device to enable the building of an

application on a second computing device. *Id.*, pg. 13, ll. 15-17.

A.   Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a method for building an application on two computing devices. A first and a second computing device are provided. *Id.*, pg. 4, ll. 2-17. The second computing device has a controlling process managing at least one group of servers for an environment, with the environment having parameters. *Id.*, pg. 4, ll. 2-17. A version of a file is selected by the first computing device for building a selectable version of an application on the second computing device. *Id.*, pg. 18, ll. 15-20. At least one group of servers associated with the application are deleted using the controlling process. *Id.*, pg. 25, ll. 20-23. At least one new server group is created. *Id.*, pg. 26, ll. 4-7. The selectable version of the application is built on the second computing device. *Id.*, pg. 26, ll. 9-12.

B.   Independent Claim 15

Claim 15 is directed to computer-storage media to be accessed on a first computing device for enablement of building an application on a second computing device. *Id.*, pg. 4, ll. 2-17. A first file is provided that substantially includes only parameters that do not depend on a specific environment. *Id.*, pg. 13, ll. 7-14. A second file is provided that substantially includes only parameters that are environment-specific. *Id.* The two files are accessed by the first computing device to enable the building of an application on a second computing device. *Id.*

C.   Independent Claim 21

Claim 21 is directed to computer-storage media to be accessed on a first computing device for enablement of building an application on a second computing device. *Id.*, pg. 4, ll. 2-17. A first file is provided that substantially includes only parameters that do not depend on a specific environment. *Id.* A second file is provided that substantially includes only parameters that are environment-specific. *Id.* The two files are utilized by the first computing device to

access selectable files that enable the building of an application on a second computing device. *Id.*

D.   Claim 2

Claim 2 is directed to the method of claim 1 that utilizes at least one environmental-configuration file to supply the parameters needed by the controlling process for environmental configuration. *Id.*, pg. 25, ll. 10-13.

E.   Claim 3

Claim 3 is directed to the method of claim 2 that utilizes the environmental-configuration file to accomplish the deleting step by messaging the controller. *Id.*, pg. 25, ll. 20-24.

F.   Claim 4

Claim 4 is directed to the method of claim 2 utilizing scripts within the environmental-configuration file to accomplish the deleting step by messaging the controller. *Id.*, pg. 25, ll. 20-24.

G.   Claim 8

Claim 8 is directed to the method of claim 1 further including provision of a scheduler, creation of a schedule, and repetition to build according to the schedule. *Id.* pg. 11, ll. 4-10.

H.   Claim 9

Claim 9 is directed to the method of claim 8 further including a build schedule that occurs daily. *Id.*

I.   Claim 12

Claim 12 is directed to a method of claim 1 further including in the selectable version of the application an environmental-configuration extensible markup language (XML) file. *Id.*, pg. 13, ll. 7-17.

J.   Claim 13

Claim 13 is directed to a method of claim 12 further including in the selectable version of the application an object- XML file. *Id.*, pg. 13, ll. 7-17.

K.   Claim 14

Claim 14 is directed to a method of claim 13 further including a plurality of extensible stylesheet language (XSL) files. *Id.*, pg. 13, ll. 7-17.

L.   Claim 17

Claim 17 is directed to the computer-storage media of claim 15 with the second file further including a label for environment identification, a group of environment specific parameters and a group of parameters not specific to the environment. *Id.*, pg. 14, ll. 1-6.

M.   Claims 18 and 24

Claim 18 is directed to the computer-storage media of claim 17 further specifying the second file to include parameters specific to at least one server. *Id.*, pg. 14, ll. 7-14.

Claim 24 is similarly directed but depends on claims 21-23.

N.   Claims 20 and 26

Claim 20 is directed to the computer-storage media of claim 15 with the application dynamically adaptable to multiple environments by editing the second file. *Id.*, pg. 14, ll. 15-22.

Claim 26 is similarly directed but depends on claim 21.

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTIONS TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The following recites each ground of rejection presented herein for review by the Board:

1. Whether claims 1-11 are anticipated by Boehm et al. (US 6,457,170, hereafter "Boehm") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

2. Whether claims 12-14 are unpatentable over Boehm in view of Obilisetty under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

      3.   Whether claims 15-26 are anticipated by Obilisetty et al. (US 2004/0268344, hereafter "Obilisetty") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

VII.   ARGUMENT

    A.   **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over US Patent 6,457,170 to Boehm et al. The office has failed to meet its burden for anticipation by Boehm.**

        Claims 1-11.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 1-11 are not disclosed by *Boehm* either expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." MPEP § 2111. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. MPEP § 2131. The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. MPEP § 2131

        1.   *Boehm does not disclose building a software application on a second computing device.*

There are at least four reasons *Boehm* does not disclose building a software application on a second computing device as recited by the present claims. The claims recite features showing that the application is actually built by the second computing device, unlike *Boehm*. The disclosure of *Boehm* never discloses on what computing device and in what manner an application is built. The broadest interpretation given by the Examiner would be inconsistent with the broadest interpretation consistent with the *Specification*. The functions of the two computing devices are recited in the claims, but the Examiner "mixes and matches" features of *Boehm* to reach these features.

The Examiner asserts in the Advisory Action dated January 8, 2008 (hereinafter "the Advisory Action"), that the feature of building an application <u>on</u> a second computing device

does not necessarily mean that the application is built <u>by</u> the second computing device (emphasis added). This runs counter to the features of the claims. The second computing device includes features of a "controlling process for an environment," "managing at least one group of servers" in the environment with the controlling process, deleting "at least one group of servers which are associated with the application using the controlling process," and "creating at least one new server group in the environment." These features are all examples of tasks carried out <u>by</u> the second computing device. In addition, these are all features of building the application. If all of these features are accomplished by the second computing device, and are features of building the application, then the claims recite the features of building the application <u>on</u> the second computing device <u>by</u> the second computing device.

Moreover, if the claims are given the interpretation put forth by the Examiner, then the application would have to be either built on the network controller 30, or by the network controller. There is no indication that network controller 30 can provide such a function. In the Final Office Action dated July 3, 2007 (hereinafter "the Final Action"), the element of "creating at least one new server group in the environment" is cited from *Boehm* Fig. 2, element 100, and related text. The disclosure cited from *Boehm* for element 100 is a build list that is described as a list of links at the local workstation, i.e. at workstation 10. *See* col. 6, ll. 4-6. The Examiner references Fig. 2, element 300, and its related text as anticipating many features of the present invention in the Final Action. There are only two phrases regarding this step in the entirety of *Boehm* and neither states where the compilation occurs, only that the program is built. *See* col. 5, ll. 56-57; col. 8, ll. 39-41. This is because *Boehm* is concerned with using version-controlling software and a workstation in a networked environment. *Boehm* does not use a second

computing device to <u>build</u> the application. At best, *Boehm* discloses the use of additional storage memory by a networked storage element.

While claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation, patent examining procedure requires that it be **consistent with the specification**. The instant *Specification* discloses that the second computing device used for building a software application is a Tandem™ computer. *See Specification*, pg. 3, ll. 3-10. This computer replaces the need of using computational resources of the desktop computer (first computing device) on which the application is edited. *Id.*, pg. 3, ll. 3-10. Replacing computational resources requires that the application be built <u>by</u> the second computer. This is far different than providing additional memory, version-controlling capabilities, and faster retrieval from memory as disclosed in *Boehm*. *See Abstract*. The description of central network controller 30 of *Boehm* discloses that it includes a file server, a software library archive and one or more network cache memories. *See* col. 5, ll. 29-34. There is no mention in *Boehm* of being able to build the application either by or on network controller 30.

In the Final Action, the Examiner has cited workstation 10 as the first computing device and network controller 30 as the second computing device. *See* pg. 4. In asserting his interpretation of claim language in the Advisory Action, the Examiner cites that workstation 10 performs the function of the second computing device and network controller 30 performs as the first computing device. In citing other features of the present invention, the Examiner has selected portions of each device to purportedly anticipate the present invention. For example, the software configuration control system of network controller 30 is cited in the Final Action for accomplishing part of the deleting step, but the reference also refers to multiple parallel builds on different workstations (i.e. on workstation 10). *See Boehm*, col. 2, ll. 7-20. However, the

interaction between the two devices is clearly delineated in the claim language and cannot be

anticipated by this "mixed and matched" approach. Therefore, *Boehm* cannot anticipate the

present claims.

> 2.   *Boehm does not disclose building a software application compatible with multiple environments.*

The present claims recite creation and deletion of environments, along with the

manipulation of environmental-configuration parameters. The implicit reasoning for these

features are the use of the systems, methods, and media in a variety of environments. This

requires computational abilities of multiple environments, such as is available with a Tandem™

computer. *See Specification*, pg. 3, ll. 7-10. The disclosure of *Boehm* states that an RCS

environment can be used. *See* Abstract. However, there is no indication that *Boehm* is

compatible with multiple environments as recited in the instant claims. A plurality of servers as

recited by *Boehm* does not automatically infer with it a plurality of environments. For this

reason, *Boehm* falls short of anticipating the present claims.

> 3.   *Boehm does not disclose deleting at least one group of servers to build a software application.*

The Examiner cites Fig. 9, step 468 and related text in *Boehm* as anticipating

deleting at least one group of servers to build a software application. However, the cited

limitations include deletion of a group of files. This does not necessarily remove a group of

servers, while the claim is specific in what must be deleted. The feature of the claim prevents

legacy server classes from creating problems in the compilation of new software. *See*

Specification, pg. 3, ll. 22-23. However the deletion of *Boehm* is predicated on date, not on the

type of file. *See* col. 17, ll. 29-32. Thus, *Boehm* performs a housekeeping function of removing

out-of-date files on the archiving system, not one that improves correct application building.

Deletion is included as a regular portion of <u>each</u> build process in the instant claims, while deletion disclosed in *Boehm* only happens after a certain date. *Id.* Thus, Boehm cannot anticipate the claimed invention.

> **4.** *Boehm does not disclose utilizing an environmental-configuration file to build a software application.*

The cited portion of *Boehm* does not disclose a file for use in the configuration of a software build, only that files may be checked in and out within a library "archiving" system. *See* col. 5, ll. 30-43. The software configuration control system referenced by the Examiner allows the proper versions of source and object files to be used. *See* col. 5, ll. 30-43. There is nothing in the disclosure of *Boehm* that indicates that one of the files to be checked in or out drives the build process. At least one novel aspect of the present invention is the automation of the build process by utilizing the claimed file in the build process. *See Specification*, pg. 6, ll. 2-5. *Boehm* lacks an environmental-configuration file, use of one in building a software application, or automation resulting from this use. Therefore, *Boehm* does not anticipate the claims.

> **5.** *Boehm does not disclose utilizing an environmental-configuration file or scripts within the file to message the controller to delete an environment.*

Scripts are disclosed in *Boehm* in only two places: to update the cache memory locations once files have been tested and to create directory structures. *See* col. 16, ll. 45-65; col. 8, ll. 1-10. However, there are no details for deletion of files other than the removal of out-of-date files once a threshold variable relating to file age has been passed. This is not the claimed feature of an environmental-configuration file messaging a controller to delete an environment during the build process. The process occurs during every build and is specific to the removal of legacy server data. *See Specification*, pg. 25, ll. 20-23. *Boehm* lacks an environmental-

configuration file as recited. *Boehm* lacks messaging for deletion of files <u>in response to a build</u>. Therefore, *Boehm* cannot provide the feature of such a file messaging a controller for deletion of these files and does not anticipate the present claims.

> 6.   *<u>Boehm does not disclose a scheduler or a build schedule for building on a prescribed basis.</u>*

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that a build schedule would reasonably include a build list, as disclosed by *Boehm*. *See* Fig. 2, element 100. However, Applicant stated that there is no mention of a build schedule or scheduler in the reference. The fact that the schedule would include the cited build list does not anticipate the schedule as claimed. Furthermore, there is neither mention of a scheduler in *Boehm* nor has the Examiner cited a scheduler. The cited step and figure of the reference is a <u>directory creation</u> step that establishes a <u>directory structure</u> for the build process. Nothing is disclosed regarding the scheduling aspect. Absent a scheduler and a schedule, *Boehm* is silent to this feature and cannot anticipate the claimed embodiments.

For at least these reasons, *Boehm* does not anticipate claims 1-11 and they are allowable. The specific deficiencies of individual claims are given below.

> *<u>Claim 1</u>.*

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claim 1 are not disclosed by *Boehm* either expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131. *Boehm* does not disclose building a software application on a second computing device, building a software application compatible with multiple environments, or deleting at least one group of servers to build software. The interpretation given the Examiner is not consistent with the specification. MPEP § 2111. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claim 2 are not disclosed by *Boehm* either expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131. In addition to the features absent in claim 1, *Boehm* does not disclose utilizing an environmental-configuration file to build a software application. For at least these reasons, claim 2 is allowable.

Claims 3 and 4.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 3 and 4 are not disclosed by *Boehm* either expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131. In addition to the features absent in claims 1 or 2, *Boehm* does not utilize an environmental-configuration file to delete one or more server groups, or scripts within said file to do so. For at least these reasons, claims 3 and 4 are allowable.

Claim 8 and 9.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 8 and 9 are not disclosed by *Boehm* either expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131. In addition to the features absent in claim 1, *Boehm* is silent to a schedule, a build schedule or daily builds. For at least these reasons, claims 8 and 9 are allowable.

B.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US Patent 6,457,170 to Boehm et al. in view of US Patent Application 2004/0268344 to Obilisetty et al. The office has failed to meet its burden for *prima facie* obviousness over Boehm in view of Obilisetty.

Claims 12-14.

All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have

been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. MPEP §

2141.02, Sec. I.

>   1.   *Boehm and Obilisetty, alone or in combination, fail to render the claims*
>   *obvious.*

>   *Boehm* , at best, discloses the use of version-controlling software and network

memory to aid in application building. *See* Abstract. *Obilisetty* distributes applications through

use of a client-side agent and XML files. *See* Abstract. The combination, however, cannot

render claims of environmental-configuration files, object-XML files or a plurality of XSL files

used for building a software application as obvious. In addition to the deficiencies in *Boehm*

cited above, the combination would need to render obvious the use of the specified files. The

only disclosure in *Obilisetty* is for an agent to assemble an application on a client-side computer.

See paragraph [0037]. There is no mention of the specificity recited in the claims, nor how the

files form the application. *Obilisetty* discloses that one file forms one application and a different

file forms a different application. *Id.* This does not render the environment-configuration files,

object-XML files and XSL files obvious.

>   2.   *The disclosure of Obilisetty teaches away from a combination with Boehm*
>   *to render the claims obvious.*

>   Paragraph [0048] of *Obilisetty* is relied upon for motivation to combine the

references. However, the only feature disclosed in the cited paragraph is the ability to create

different applications from different files. In paragraph [0016] of *Obilisetty* , it is disclosed that

the **best mode** of the reference can operate **asynchronously**. Without a requirement between

two computers for operation of the invention, *Obilisetty* actually teaches away from the

combination of references. At least one novel aspect of the present claims is the ease with which

an application can be built using two computers. This runs counter to the use of a file on a single

computer for the delivery of an application. Without a motivation to use two computers for application construction, the claims are not obvious.

C.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over US Patent Application 2004/0268344 to Obilisetty et al. The office has failed to meet its burden for anticipation by Obilisetty.

Claims 15-26.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 15-26 are not disclosed by *Obilisetty* either expressly or inherently. MPEP § 2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. MPEP § 2131.

1.   *Obilisetty does not disclose the use of configuration files containing environment-specific parameters and application-specific parameters.*

The claimed invention particularly recites that the files used by the two computers for building a software application control either the environment or the specifics of the application. *Obilisetty* does not disclose the use of files broken up in this manner. The only disclosure in the reference is that one set of files actuate one application when run by agent 205 and that another set of files implement another application when run by the same agent. *See* paragraph [0037]. There is no mention of environment-specific parameters. Likewise, other than the fact that one set of files create a specific application, there is no mention of a file containing application-specific parameters. *Id.* It could be that the system of *Obilisetty* requires the use of numerous files to create an application. There may be some files used for more than one application, rather than a single file for each application separately. Without further description, *Obilisetty* does not set out the claimed invention in the same level of detail as recited in the claims. Therefore, there is no anticipation by *Obilisetty*.

2.   _Obilisetty does not disclose the identification of an environment in which an application is run._

The claimed invention includes a label for identifying an environment, a group of environmental parameters specific to the environment but not specific to the application, and a group of application parameters that are specific to the environment. The cited disclosure in _Obilisetty_ does not provide these features. The Examiner has cited that different user interfaces may be set up according to user preferences. _See Action_, pg. 11 citing _Obilisetty_, paragraph [0051]. Even if these were interpreted to anticipate environments, which Applicant argues they should not, there is still a lack of labels and parameters disclosed in _Obilisetty_. The reference must include as much detail as recited in the claim, which it does not, and therefore does not anticipate the claimed embodiments.

3.   _Obilisetty does not disclose server-specific parameters._

The cited portions of _Obilisetty_ disclose that sets of XML files are able to provide different applications when assembled on agent 205. _See_ paragraph [0037]. However, there is no feature found in _Obilisetty_ where a second file substantially includes the more narrowly defined environment-specific parameters that are used for one server. _Obilisetty_ discloses that the reference system can operate without a client-server relationship and therefore a requirement for parameters specific to one server would run counter to the operation disclosed. Again, the reference must include as much detail as claimed and therefore _Obilisetty_ cannot anticipate the present claims.

4.   _Obilisetty does not disclose dynamic capabilities to adapt the application to multiple environments._

Obilisetty discloses that different applications are available, but the reference also discloses that different sets of files are required for different applications. _Id._ There is no

disclosure, however, that the second file of environmental-specific configurations of an application can be edited to dynamically adapt to multiple environments in the second computing device. The instant *Specification* discloses that the Tandem™ computer is capable of multiple environments. *See Specification*, pg. 3, ll. 7-10. There is no disclosure that *Obilisetty* is capable of providing multiple environments. Without multiple environments, the ability to dynamically adapt to them must also be absent. Thus, *Obilisetty* does not anticipate the claimed embodiments.

For at least these reasons, *Obilisetty* does not anticipate claims 15-26 and they are allowable. The specific deficiencies of individual claims are given below.

Claims 15 and 21.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 15 and 21 are neither disclosed by *Obilisetty* either expressly or inherently, nor is the claimed level of detail given. MPEP § 2131. The environment-specific and application-specific files recited are absent from *Obilisetty*. For at least these reasons, claims 15 and 21 are allowable.

Claim 17.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 15 and 21 are neither disclosed by *Obilisetty* either expressly or inherently, nor is the claimed level of detail given. MPEP § 2131. In addition to the features absent in claim 15, *Obilisetty* is silent to a label or the groups of parameters recited. For at least these reasons, claim 17 is allowable.

Claims 18 and 24.

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 15 and 21 are neither disclosed by *Obilisetty* either expressly or inherently, nor is the claimed level of detail given. MPEP § 2131. In addition to the features absent in claims 15 and 21, *Obilisetty* lacks a number

of parameters specific to at least one server. For at least these reasons, claims 18 and 24 are

allowable.

>*Claims 20 and 26.*

Applicant respectfully submits that all features of claims 15 and 21 are neither

disclosed by *Obilisetty* either expressly or inherently, nor is the claimed level of detail given.

MPEP § 2131. In addition to the features absent in claims 15 and 21, *Obilisetty* lacks dynamic

adaptation capabilities for multiple environments. For at least these reasons, claims 20 and 26

are allowable.

For at least the reasons listed above, claims 1-4, 8-9, 12-15, 17-18, 20-21, 24, and

26 are believed to be in condition for allowance, as are claims 5-7, 10-11, 16, 19, 22-23, and 25

at least by virtue of their dependence upon allowable independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Kirkwood/

Steven M. Kirkwood
Reg. No. 56,392

JJCZ/SMK

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
Tel.:   816/474-6550
Fax: 816/421-5547

Attorney Docket No. 2675/SPRI.111309

Appendices follow.

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1.   (previously presented) A method of building an application having one or more versions, said method including the steps of:

providing a first computing device;

providing a second computing device having a controlling process for an environment, said environment having parameters, said controlling process managing at least one group of servers in said environment;

selecting at least one file directed to a selectable version of said application from said one or more versions using said first computing device for the purpose of building the selectable version of the application on said second computing device;

deleting said at least one group of servers which are associated with the application using said controlling process;

creating at least one new server group in the environment; and

building said selectable version of said application on said second computing device.

2.   (original) The method of claim 1 wherein said deleting step comprises the additional step of:

including as said at least one file an environmental-configuration file which includes a plurality of environmental configurations for the parameters of the controlling process environment.

3.   (original) The method of claim 2 including the step of :

using said environmental-configuration file to message the controller to accomplish the deleting step.

4.   (original) The method of claim 2 including the step of:

including scripts within said environmental-configuration file;

using said scripts to message the controller to accomplish the deleting step.

5.   (original) The method of claim 4 comprising the additional step of :

using said scripts to configure new server groups in the environment.

6.   (original) The method of claim 4 comprising the additional step of :

providing a command interface for enabling said scripts to message said controller.

7.   (original) The method of claim 6 comprising:

selecting Pathcom™ as the command interface which is provided for enabling said scripts to message said controller.

8.   (original) The method of claim 1 comprising:

providing a scheduler;

creating a build schedule using said scheduler;

repeating the selecting, deleting, and building steps according to said build schedule.

9.   (original) The method of claim 8 including the step of:

creating said build schedule such that the selecting locating, deleting, and building steps to occur daily.

10.   (original) The method of claim 1 comprising:

enabling the selecting locating, deleting, and building steps to occur on-demand.

11.　　(previously presented)　The method of claim 1 including the additional steps of:

checking said selectable version of said application into a version control system;

associating the selectable version with a tag; and

referencing said selectable version in a version control system using said tag in order to accomplish said selecting step.

12.　　(previously presented)　The method of claim 1 comprising:

including in said selectable version of the application an environmental-configuration containing XML file.

13.　　(previously presented)　The method of claim 12 comprising:

including in said selectable version of the application an object-XML file.

14.　　(previously presented)　The method of claim 13 comprising:

including with said selectable version of said application a plurality of XSL files.

15.　　(previously presented)　One or more computer-storage media having computer-executable instructions embodied thereon to perform a method comprising:

providing a first file that substantially includes only the parameters for configuration of an application that do not depend upon a specific environment;

providing a second file that substantially includes only the parameters for configuration of said application that are environment-specific; and

wherein said first and second files are accessed by a first computing device to enable the building of an application on a second computing device.

16.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 15 in which said first and second files are XML files.

17.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 15 in which the second file further comprises:

a label for identifying an environment into which the application is to be run;

a group of environmental parameters which are specific to the environment, but not specific to the application; and

a group of application parameters which are specific to the environment.

18.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 17 in which said second file further comprises:

a number of parameters specific to at least one server.

19.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 18, further comprising:

a set of scripts that accept the first and second files as inputs to create output files that are useable in the second computing device.

20.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 15 in which the environmental requirements of an environment in the second computing device may be configured by editing said second file in said first computing device making the application dynamically adaptable to multiple environments in the second computing device.

21. (previously presented) One or more computer-storage media having computer-executable instructions embodied thereon for performing a method of building an application, said method comprising:

providing a first file that includes substantially only the parameters for configuration of the application that do not depend upon a specific environment;

providing a second file that includes substantially only the parameters for configuration of the application that are environment-specific; and

a first computing device utilizing said first and second files to access selectable files to enable the building an application on a second computing device.

22. (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 21, further comprising:

creating said first and second files in XML.

23. (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 22, further comprising:

identifying an environment into which the application is to be run using a label;

including a group of environmental parameters in said second file which are specific to the environment, but not specific to the application; and

including a group of application parameters in said second file which are specific to the environment.

24. (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 23, further comprising:

including a number of parameters specific to at least one server in said second

file.

25.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 24, further

comprising:

including in said second file a script that accepts the first and second files as

inputs to create output files that are useable in the second computing device.

26.   (previously presented) The computer-storage media of claim 21, further

comprising:

dynamically adapting the application to multiple environments in said second

computing device by editing said second file.

IX.   EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

X.   RELATED-PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None